



Lewthwaite, Stephanie (2016) Recovering mestiza genealogies in contemporary New Mexican art: Delilah Montoya's *El sagrado corazón* (1993). *Frontiers*, 37 (1). pp. 118-150. ISSN 0160-9009

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/36127/1/RECOVERING%20MESTIZA%20GENEALOGIES%20FINAL.pdf>

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:
http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

Stephanie Lewthwaite

Recovering Mestiza Genealogies in Contemporary New Mexican Art: Delilah

Montoya's *El Sagrado Corazón* (1993)

A portrait should be more than a topographical likeness. It should point to the historical, social and economic status of the subject.

- Delilah Montoya, 2013¹

Our lived reality had never been expressed artistically. We were drawing on a collective memory, a memory of absence. We're trying to discuss things that have never been discussed.

- Delilah Montoya, 2000²

In her *El Sagrado Corazón* (Sacred Heart) series from the early 1990s, photographer Delilah Montoya replays the colonial history of New Mexico in order to reveal the mixed, Indo-Hispano heritage of her mother's birthplace. In a vital portrait from the series, Montoya addresses the neglected role that *Genízaros* or captive Native peoples played in shaping Spanish-speaking Hispano culture and society in New Mexico.³ By depicting a captive Native girl in *La Genízara*, Montoya rewrites the colonial past as a history rooted in the slavery and oppression of indigenous women and children. From the sixteenth century onwards, colonial rule in New Mexico shaped the creation of distinct hierarchies of race, class, and gender, which became tied to systems of caste, servitude, and patriarchy. Vestiges of colonial power and myth-making continue to determine the status of New Mexico's Hispano population today. In contemporary New Mexico, old colonial hierarchies and caste systems play themselves out through the state-sanctioned myth of tri-cultural harmony, in

which Hispano, Anglo-American, and Native American populations remain distinct from one another, with Hispanos identifying as “Spanish” rather than as mixed or *mestizo* in origin. Yet contemporary female artists such as Montoya have questioned the colonial narratives that deny *mestizaje* and privilege racial purity, social inequality, and patriarchal authority. Drawing on a “memory of absence” in order to “discuss things that have never been discussed,” Montoya recuperates the figure of La Genízara as the basis for an alternative, mixed or “*mestiza* genealogy.” This genealogy reveals patterns of oppression, ethnic affiliation, and gender solidarity that question the colonial heritage and its legacy of female disempowerment. In deconstructing colonial narratives, Montoya’s series also reworks modes of visual representation that have long supported colonial power relations, including colonial *casta* painting, ethnographic portraiture, and narrative and documentary photography. Montoya transforms these modes of visual representation from tools of colonization into a foundation for critique and activism in the present.

Colonialism and colonial myths

New Mexican artists have had to unravel several layers of colonial history; Spanish colonialism from the sixteenth century and U.S. American rule from the mid-nineteenth century following the war between Mexico and the United States from 1846 to 1848. Between the arrival of Spanish colonizer Juan de Oñate in 1598 and the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, the Viceroyalty of New Spain subjected New Mexico’s Native peoples to violent rule and coercive evangelization. Under the banner of a “just war,” Spanish colonizers also enslaved unpacified Native peoples, whom they called *indios bárbaros* and *gente sin razón* (literally, “people without reason”). Although the enslavement of Pueblo Indians lessened after the Spanish “Reconquest” of New Mexico in 1693, Spanish settlers could legally buy or “rescue” Native captives taken in war on condition that they Christianize and “redeem” their

subjects. The practice of ransoming captives intensified during the eighteenth century when Spanish conflict with the Navajo, Apache, and Comanche increased.⁴ These captives were known as Genízaros or detribalized Native peoples. Most were women and children who would produce mixed-ancestry offspring from their position as slaves and servants within Spanish households. In response to the growth of Genízaros and a broader *mestizo* population, Spanish colonists established a *casta* system in which honor and social status were linked directly to racial purity. The *casta* system operated differently in frontier regions such as New Mexico, where the existence of Pueblo and nomadic Native tribes shaped interethnic encounters and gave a distinctive meaning to the term “genízaro.” The fluctuating social conditions and scarce administrative resources associated with frontier life led to inconsistencies in the use and recording of *casta* categories by local populations and census takers alike, with some *casta* designations collapsing into more expansive and simplified categories that worked to differentiate Spanish from non-Spanish populations. Although the *casta* system acknowledged interethnic unions and *mestizaje* through the proliferation of multiple racial categories during the eighteenth century, ultimately, the system sanctioned blood purity as an organizing principle of colonial society. Despite the “blurring” of lines between established racial designations in New Mexico, the inferior status accorded to non-Spanish *castas* was never in any doubt.⁵

After the United States’ territorial acquisition of the Southwest following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, New Mexico’s Spanish-speaking inhabitants lost land, political power, and social status. Anglo-American in-migration and railroad building brought tourism, artist colonies, and the arrival of preservationists who sponsored the “recovery” of Hispano culture during the 1920s and 1930s. From the early 1900s, new myths about racial purity, built on a romanticized Spanish colonial past, emerged to meet the economic and psychological needs of Anglo-American patrons, boosters, and tourists: New Mexico was

promoted as a tri-cultural society in which Anglo, Hispano, and Pueblo communities coexisted harmoniously with distinct ethno-cultural identities and relationships to the land. In the tri-cultural narrative, Hispanos were relics of a sixteenth-century colonial past that had been preserved intact as a result of New Mexico's "isolation" from the rest of New Spain and Mexico. As direct descendants of the first Spanish colonists, Hispanos were of "pure" Spanish blood rather than of mixed ancestry, and "Spanish American" as opposed to "Mexican," a term that acquired a degraded, racialized status under Anglo-American rule. Anglo boosters used the Spanish colonial myth to sell New Mexico as a tourist destination and a land of enchantment steeped in archaic cultural traditions. Anglo campaigners for New Mexico's incorporation as a U.S. state, which was achieved in 1912, also employed the myth to refute claims that the demographically important Hispano population was of indigenous or *mestizo* ancestry, non-white, and therefore unfit to govern. As their economic and political power diminished, Hispano elites also embraced the Spanish purity myth to claim whiteness and citizenship under Anglo rule.⁶

The Spanish colonial myth became manifest in the historical pageantry of the Santa Fe Fiesta and in architectural revivals. It also shaped the development of a distinct market for Spanish colonial art, Santa Fe's Spanish Market, which remains separate to this day from Indian Market, a tradition that began in 1925 when Anglo artist-patrons revived the annual Santa Fe Fiesta. The Spanish colonial model, however, has served as a "trap" by relegating Hispanos and their cultural production to a pre-modern space bound by tradition and authenticity.⁷ More broadly, the colonial myth has stymied the exploration of New Mexico's history of *mestizaje* together with a critique of social inequalities and conflicts that lie beneath the façade of tri-cultural harmony. The Spanish colonial myth has intensified opposition towards the revision of colonial narratives and iconography among Anglos, and among conservative Hispanos whose ethnic pride has become embedded in perpetuating the

colonial myth. This opposition is apparent in the reaction to contemporary art projects that question the Spanish colonial myth.

Questioning the Spanish colonial myth

In 1984 Texas-born sculptor Luis Jiménez created a public fiberglass sculpture for Albuquerque's Old Town entitled *Southwest Pietà*. The sculpture depicts a legend from Nahua mythology: the Aztec warrior Popocápetl is shown cradling his dead lover, the princess Ixtaccíhuatl, before being reunited with her in death after both are transformed by the gods into the volcanoes that circle the Valley of Mexico. For the location of the sculpture, the City of Albuquerque chose Tiguex Park near to Albuquerque's Old Town and the city's museum complex, both of which are integral to local tourism and the Spanish heritage industry. Conservative Hispano elites criticised *Southwest Pietà* for "desecrating" Spanish colonial memory: one critic suggested that Jiménez's sculpture portrayed the "aftermath" of the rape of indigenous women by Spanish conquistadors. Protests led to the sculpture's removal, and it was eventually installed in the neighbourhood park of Martineztown, a working-class Mexican American community near downtown Albuquerque, where it remains today. In the aftermath of the controversy, Jiménez challenged the tri-cultural myth by declaring that "[t]o proclaim a kind of ethnic purity flies in the face of reality. We all got mixed up a long time ago."⁸ In 1998 in Alcalde, north of Española, protesters defaced a sculpture of New Mexico's first Spanish governor, Juan de Oñate, used to mark Oñate's founding of the first Spanish colony in 1598. In 1599, after fierce indigenous opposition to Spanish rule, Oñate ordered the right foot of every man in Acoma Pueblo to be cut off. Four hundred years later as the celebrations for the *cuarto* centennial approached, protestors removed Oñate's right foot from the sculpture. The act exposed the myth of tri-cultural harmony and the erasure of Native American historical memory from the Spanish colonial

narrative; it also suggested how art can generate spaces for debating competing colonial narratives and the elision of New Mexico's indigenous heritage from Hispano cultural memory.⁹

Some of the most complex and incisive critiques of these colonial myths have come from artists affiliated with Chicana feminist practices that have their roots outside of New Mexico. Operating within a broader Mexican/Mexican American diaspora, Chicana artists have done much to expose the multiple race, class, and gender-based oppressions stemming from colonialism. In 2001 controversy broke out over the allegedly "sacrilegious" digital portrait of an indigenized and partially naked Virgin Mary of Guadalupe by Los Angeles-based Chicana artist Alma López. López's *Our Lady* (1999) was part of the *Cyber Arte: Tradition Meets Technology* exhibition curated by Tey Marianna Nunn at Santa Fe's Museum of International Folk Art. López's Virgin wears a garland of roses, symbolizing Guadalupe's appearance to the Indian Juan Diego in 1531, and a stone cloak adorned with pre-Columbian iconography to signify the presence of Coyolxauhqui, the Aztec warrior moon goddess. A bare-breasted female angel with butterfly wings floats below López's syncretic Virgin. López reincarnated the Virgin as an emblem of Chicana hybridity and empowerment in the guise of Coyolxauhqui to represent what she called "the multiplicities of our lived realities."¹⁰ For Chicana feminist writer Cherríe Moraga, Coyolxauhqui is "La Hija Rebelde [The Rebellious Daughter]," a figure who symbolizes "la fuerza femenina [the feminine force], our attempt to pick up the fragments of our dismembered womanhood and reconstitute ourselves." "She is motherhood reclaimed and sisterhood honoured," adds Moraga.¹¹ In *Our Lady*, López established a "deep and meaningful connection" between the Virgin and what she, like Moraga, perceived as a "revolutionary cultural female image." While Guadalupe protects and inspires *mestiza* women across the Mexican diaspora, it was Coyolxauhqui, the warrior

goddess daughter of Coatlicue, who staged a revolt against her sibling, the unborn god of war, Huitzilopochtli.¹²

Anglo and Hispano protesters in Santa Fe's Catholic community reacted angrily, however; arguing that *Our Lady* was a colonial icon of purity and tradition, they demanded the removal of the sacrilegious image. Some of the protesters attacked López for being an "outsider" connected to a more radically-informed, Los Angeles-based Chicana community. As one exhibition visitor tellingly stated of *Our Lady*, "That art is not our local Hispanic art."¹³ Alicia Gaspar de Alba suggests that out of all the Southwestern states, New Mexico remains steadfastly committed to elevating Spanishness alongside "its Catholic colonization." Indeed, Chicana historian Deena González suggests that "a certain competition" emerged in Santa Fe between the *mestiza* Virgin of Guadalupe, whose roots lie deep in indigenous Mexico, and La Conquistadora (Our Lady of Conquest), the Spanish *criolla* (creole) virgin whose procession during Santa Fe's annual fiesta commemorates Diego de Vargas' "reconquest" of New Mexico following the Pueblo Revolt.¹⁴ While the *Our Lady* protest reflected deeper conflicts over cultural ownership, appropriation, and colonial memory, these conflicts were inextricably tied to a predominantly male cadre of protestors who condemned what they viewed as a disruption of established gender and sexual norms within the Catholic faith.¹⁵

In June 2001, female artists based in New Mexico leapt to López's defence by organising a follow-up exhibition in Santa Fe entitled, *Las Malcriadas: Coloring out the Lines*. "Las malcriadas" translates as badly behaved women and girls in Spanish, or "those who do not know their place." According to Alicia Gaspar de Alba, the term was adopted as an assertive counter-response to the derogatory phrase applied to Chicana feminists during the Chicano Movement, "Las Malinches," meaning "traitors," so called after Cortes' Nahua Indian mistress, La Malinche.¹⁶ One of the artists who supported López in *Las Malcriadas*

was photographer Delilah Montoya. Montoya had already begun to challenge New Mexico's model of racial politics by documenting patterns of indigeneity, *mestizaje*, and gender oppression obscured by the Spanish colonial myth, thus complementing López's revision of colonial Catholic iconography. Prior to the controversy that surrounded López in 2001, Montoya was criticized for her use of the Virgin in the *Guadalupe Tattoo* series, which featured the installations "La Guadalupana" (1998) and "Guadalupe En Piel" (2000), both based on the black-and-white photograph of a prison inmate whose back is tattooed with Guadalupe's image as a symbol of redemption. Montoya recalled the words of a Santa Fe critic who "said I was ghetto-izing myself.... She called the Guadalupe a 'bankrupt stereotype.'" ¹⁷ From the 1990s, Montoya turned the framework of Chicana feminist critique towards an exploration of New Mexico's Indo-Hispano heritage and the excavation of an alternative *mestiza* genealogy.

Delilah Montoya's *El Sagrado Corazón* (1993)

Born of Anglo and Hispana parentage in Fort Worth, Texas, in 1955, Montoya spent much of her early life in Omaha, Nebraska. Here she witnessed the struggles of Mexican migrant workers in Omaha's packing house district, the protests of African American civil rights activists in Malcolm X's birthplace, and the radicalism of the Chicano community organization, the Brown Berets. "This is why I became politicized," she later explained. During childhood, however, Montoya maintained a strong affiliation with her mother's homeland of New Mexico, spending summers with grandparents in Las Vegas, and then moving to New Mexico in the 1970s to raise her daughter. "It was always understood as home," she stressed. Montoya went on to complete her BA, MA, and MFA at the University of New Mexico between 1984 and 1994, with periods working in medical and commercial photography. As an insider/outsider, Montoya has done much to bring politicized Chicano art

into the orbit of Hispano New Mexico, where a traditional model of Spanish colonial art still dominates the market. In 2000, she curated *Nuevo Me-Xicanos: Contemporary Chicano Art of New Mexico* at Albuquerque's Magnifico! Gallery. An exhibition of political artwork that traced its lineage back to the Chicano Movement of the 1960s was a radical departure in a state where, as Montoya explained, "Chicano art has never been supported."¹⁸ Although now living and working outside of New Mexico, Montoya claims that her mother's homeland remains "the source of [her] inspiration."¹⁹

Montoya has described herself as "a Chicana in occupied America." The history and legacy of colonialism remain central concerns for Montoya, whose aim, she explains, "is to comprehend colonialism as the substructure of our contemporary social footprint."²⁰ Citing Judy Chicago, Robert Mapplethorpe, and Bruce Davidson as influences, Montoya developed a keen interest in the history of photography, exploring in particular the problematic workings of documentary photography and portraiture alongside the potentialities of conceptual photography and collaborative image-making. Montoya's interest in photographic portraiture's connection to the colonial gaze and forms of ethnographic spectacle is evident in her reverse-ethnography series *From the West: Shooting the Tourist* (1993) and *To Be Invisible* (1997). In "Nameless" from *To Be Invisible*, the female ethnic other disrupts the act of looking from the perspective of subject, viewer, and photographer by using hand gestures to simultaneously mask and unmask her face and eyes. Montoya's series plays on existing cultures of display and what critic Jennifer González has referred to more broadly as "econom[ies] of visibility" and "invisibility."²¹ Montoya described these images as "a parody about the surreal/subconscious discourse as it appropriates the *other* as primitive archetypes."²² Indeed, much of her work also interrogates the fine line between subjection and agency in photographic portraiture, and the complicity of the photographer—herself—in the process of objectification. Montoya's strategy of parodying forms of ethnographic

spectacle also underpins *Shooting the Tourist* (1993), in which she turns her gaze towards the world of Southwestern tourism which helped to forge the image of the ethnic other in the cultural imagination. Her fold-out postcard images narrativize the acts of “Looking,” “Collecting,” “Going Native,” and “Syncretizing,” the latter capturing instances of cultural mixing that usually lie outside the view of the tourist’s camera lens.

Montoya’s photographic work is invested, she explains, in “the discovery and articulation of ... those cultures that have a profound influence on how my world is understood.” Although she describes her work as “an autobiographical exploration” it is also “more than a personal statement, for it is rooted in and informed by history,” she adds.²³ Montoya’s exploration of the cultural encounters that have shaped the history of Chicanos and visual representation more broadly chime with Chon Noriega’s assessment of Chicano photography. Noriega writes that in Chicano photography “narrative provides a way of subordinating [established] styles and idioms to a new photographic language able to tell a particular story located at the crossroads of conflicting historical perspectives,” what he calls “histories-in-relation.”²⁴ In the collotype portrait series *El Sagrado Corazón* (Sacred Heart, 1993), Montoya subverts narrative and ethnographic photographic genres in order to undertake her own exploration of these “histories-in-relation,” and to reveal neglected patterns of religious syncretism and colonial oppression.²⁵

Montoya’s New Mexican heritage, which includes her grandfather’s membership in the Hispano lay confraternity The Penitente Brotherhood, has inspired the artist’s exploration of *mestizaje* and its relationship to colonialism, specifically in the religious sphere. In *El Sagrado Corazón* (1993), Montoya examines Sacred Heart iconography as tangible evidence of the religious hybridity that developed in the colonial Americas, specifically as the Catholic version of the Sacred Heart converged with the Nahua concept of Yolteotl (meaning “heart of God” or, the sacred spirit of enlightenment), a process seen in Montoya’s image from the

series, “Teyolia,” referring to “heart” or “soul” in Nahuatl.²⁶ Created as part of her MFA degree show at the University of New Mexico, Montoya’s photographic installations were exhibited nationally and internationally at the Smithsonian, the Corcoran Gallery, and in France, Russia, and Japan, particularly after 2000. Whilst traveling widely, Montoya’s installations also remain grounded by the artist’s strong sense of place attachment to New Mexico.

Montoya’s series depicts members of an Albuquerque community interpreting the meaning of the Sacred Heart through contemporary, hybridized forms of everyday barrio life and culture, including graffiti and the use of bodily performance, stance, and gesture. The connection between *mestizaje* and corporeality is evident in many of Montoya’s portraits. For Montoya, *mestizaje* is an important “signifier of colonialism,” and its historical and material processes become tangible not just in the development of syncretic religious iconographies, but also in the form of the racialized *mestizo* body. Rafael Pérez-Torres describes the *mestizo* body as “the physical manifestation of a long, difficult, and constantly evolving colonial history.” Indeed, the *mestizo/a* body bears witness to this history as the product of violent colonial encounters and interethnic mixing. In Chicano cultural production, the lost or erased body, often represented by a deceased elder figure, stands in as a metaphor for *mestizaje* and as testimony to the traumas of colonialism and racialization.²⁷

It is no surprise that the act of “critically restaging” the body characterizes Montoya’s photography, given the deep historical connection between colonialism and the display or erasure of the ethnic subject in New Mexico’s artistic heritage.²⁸ In the eighteenth century, a tradition of *casta* painting helped to define the racial and social status of Spanish, *mestizo*, indigenous, and African-ancestry subjects, by depicting a series of family portraits—mother, father, and mixed offspring—in descending order from white to non-white (Figure 1). Art historian Magali M. Carrera views *casta* painting as a “visual strategy of surveillance,” while

Ilona Katzew locates the genre's origin in a European "culture of curiosity" that craved the visual display of all things "exotic" from the Americas.²⁹ Under U.S. American rule, Hispano and Native cultures were also "subject to display," most often in museums and through forms of ethnographic spectacle associated with the photographic work of men such as Charles Fletcher Lummis and Edward S. Curtis. While *casta* paintings made mixed-ancestry subjects visible by classifying them in inferior racial and social positions, Anglo visual culture often denied the existence of *mestizaje*, and sometimes even removed the ethnic body altogether, as in Ansel Adams' modernist photograph of an empty Hispano chapel in *Interior, Penitente Morada, New Mexico* (ca. 1929-1930) (Figure 2). Here, the colonial wooden sculpture or *santo* (saint) stands in for the members of the Hispano brotherhood, who are represented in their absence by remnants of offerings that are scattered on the floor before the altar. Montoya's work challenges these colonial economies of visibility and invisibility in which *mestizaje* is either excessively dramatized or erased from view.

Montoya's *Sacred Heart* project mirrors the *casta* painting genre in which each series was composed of sixteen different portraits, many of which referred to the sitter's clothing, lifestyle, and occupation as markers of the subject's *calidad* (character). Montoya has described these images as "works that are about love, the love of family, and those close to the heart."³⁰ Yet in *Los Jovenes* (youths) (Figure 3) and the image of two Chicanas in *La Loca (home girl) y Sweetie*, Montoya presents us with an alternative, extended family unit to that shown in the *casta* painting, namely a form of *barrio* kinship based on brotherhood and sisterhood, which Montoya views as "a metaphor for community."³¹ The Sacred Heart series also combines the conventions of portraiture with installation art to mimic the staging of ethnographic artifacts and subjects found in Anglo photographic traditions. In *Los Jovenes*, eight young Chicano/a subjects from a working-class Albuquerque barrio occupy an installation space that is not dissimilar in form and content to Ansel Adams' penitente

morada. Here, the subjects' graffiti artwork adorns the walls and floor of the installation space, much as religious iconography embellishes the back wall of the *morada* in Adams' image, while vestiges of spirituality in *Los Jovenes* are evident in the votive candles on the floor and the syncretic image of Guadalupe attached to the back wall. Yet Montoya's photograph differs from Adams' image by emphasizing the visibility of the ethnic body alongside the iconography, and the active production of this iconography by a present-day ethnic community. This visibility is heightened by the assertive gaze, stance and gestures of Montoya's individual artist-subjects, whose animated bodily performances and spirited, upbeat dispositions permeate the installation environment in a celebration of collective cultural pride and artistic accomplishment.

Montoya's portraits also mimic the anonymous Native American "types" that appeared in photographer Edward S. Curtis' *The North American Indian* (1907-1930) (Figure 4). In *Los Jovenes*, Montoya maps Edward Curtis' colonialist typology onto contemporary stereotypes about Chicano/as as urban gang members, while the term "La Loca" (literally "crazy woman") suggests racialized and gendered discourses about deviant Chicana homegirl behavior. Here, however, the expressions of young artists symbolize creativity, collectivity, and transformation rather than violent destruction. Montoya also parodies the pictorialist aesthetic used by Edward Curtis to romanticize his "vanishing Indian" subjects, fusing nineteenth-century collotype printing with contemporary graffiti to create a soft-focused image in both photographs. These images reveal not just the existence of religious hybridity, but also the subversive potential of hybrid artistic systems in which contemporary forms of graffiti and installation art are mapped onto pre-Columbian, colonial Catholic, modernist and pictorialist iconographies.³² Montoya creates a syncretic canvas on which to rewrite the existing photographic archive: mixing genres and techniques, traditional and postmodern iconographies, individual and collaborative artistry, Montoya reveals the power of alternative

mark-marking, and the ways in which, she explains, “syncretism has worked its way into our vocabulary and into our visual history.”³³

Commenting on Montoya’s work and that of other Chicana artists, Constance Cortez writes that it is Chicana artists’ ability to “employ visual code-switching and their willingness to exploit culturally polyvalent referents that gives claim to their *mestiza* consciousness.”³⁴ Montoya’s act of visual code-switching questions the existing archive and Curtis’ essentialist framework, not only by portraying *mestizo* subjects and blending narrative and documentary photographic genres with graffiti, but also by depicting *castas* and “types” that embody the historical complexity of subject formation in New Mexico. Most importantly, the girl in the white T-shirt whose gaze directly engages the viewer in *Los Jovenes*, and La Loca in *La Loca y Sweetie*, mirror other photographs in Montoya’s *Sacred Heart* series that offer an explicitly gendered understanding of colonialism, *mestizaje*, and kinship in New Mexico.

La Genízara

In *La Genízara* (Figure 5) the *mestiza* girl dressed in Native costume holds a medicine ring or sacred hoop associated with the Plains Indians. She inhabits what appears to be a religious space much like the one portrayed in Ansel Adams’ photograph from 1929. If Montoya’s *mestiza* subject disrupts established cultures of display by occupying the empty space in Ansel Adams’ image, she also performs an alternative colonial identity. Dressed in buckskin clothing that was outlawed for all colonial subjects except indigenous peoples, Montoya’s *mestiza* challenges the racialized codes of dress and social status that became embedded in the *casta* painting.³⁵ Above all, Montoya’s subject represents the intercultural and statistical reality that almost a third of New Mexico’s inhabitants by the late eighteenth century were Genízaros, detribalized Native Americans, often Navajo, Apache, Ute, Kiowa, Pawnee and sometimes Comanche, and mostly women and children, who were brought into Spanish-

Mexican households, society and culture, and into the Catholic faith through patterns of trade, war, and captivity. The Comanches, Pekka Hämäläinen argues, controlled the most expansive slave economy in the borderlands region between the 1750s and 1850s, and they often supplied the Spanish with Native slaves taken in war with the enemy, notably at trade fairs in Pecos, Taos, and Tomé where Plains Indians came to sell both material goods and human captives. In lieu of a legal slave system, the Spanish ransoming of Native captives for use as slaves and servants was justified on the basis that masters would redeem their subjects through Christianization and acculturation. Colonial records show that some 4,600 Native captives were baptized between 1700 and 1880, revealing that colonial practices of captivity and ransom persisted into the periods of Mexican and U.S. American rule.³⁶ Most Genízaros worked to pay off their ransom debt while being instructed in Catholicism and the Spanish language, hence the religious iconography surrounding Montoya's subject. While kinship networks such as *compadrazgo* (god-parentage) were used to incorporate Genízaros into the dominant society, the system was more akin to a type of slavery, particularly for women, who were subjected to forms of coercion and concubinage.³⁷

From the mid-eighteenth century onwards, Genízaro families who had been granted freedom were relocated to Belén, Tomé, Abiquiú, Ranchos de Taos, Ojo Caliente, and Las Trampas in order to create a series of "buffer" communities against Comanche, Navajo, and Apache raids on the Spanish-Mexican borderlands. Spanish-Mexican officials adopted this strategy of containment in response to the increasing size of the Genízaro population. Genízaros were also the beneficiaries of land grants made at Belén (1740), Abiquiú, Ojo Caliente (1754), and San Miguel del Vado (1794). As freed people, Genízaros became laborers and farmers; others were traders, hunters, soldiers, and interpreters whose familiarity with various Plains Indian languages enabled them to negotiate effectively with Native peoples during times of peace and conflict. According to historian Russell Magnaghi, male

Genízaros were considered “effective frontier warriors,” but also potential renegades. Many Genízaro communities retained ties with the Comanche empire while building new affiliations with Spanish settlers and local Native peoples through patterns of trade, marriage, and kinship. A number of Comanche and Kiowa subjects also settled into New Mexico’s outlying Genízaro communities.³⁸ In time, the mixed offspring of Genízaro unions with Spanish, *mestizo*, Pueblo, and other Native and *casta* groupings, “blurred the boundaries between New Mexican villagers and their Indian neighbours,” claims James Brooks.³⁹ Curtis Marez suggests that captivity and adoption complicated the division between Comanches and Spanish-Mexicans to the extent that when Anglo-Americans “rescued” Hispanos back into white “civilization” from Comanchería territory after 1848, they often could not tell Hispano and Comanche apart.⁴⁰ Nineteenth-century Anglo traders rarely perceived the demarcations between Spanish, Pueblo, and Genízaro that were first made under Spanish rule. Instead, they placed Genízaros at the lowest end of the social hierarchy and under the broader category of “*mestizo*,” thus facilitating the erasure of New Mexico’s Indo-Hispano heritage that took place under Anglo-American rule. Even though the term “Genízaro” disappeared as a legal racial category after Mexico abolished the *casta* system, practices of captivity and the use of Native servants in Spanish-speaking communities persisted well into the period of U.S. American rule.⁴¹

The Comanchería past and contemporary culture

Montoya’s *La Genízara* exposes the nomadic-Indian *mestizaje* that lies at the heart of many present-day Hispano communities. This *mestizaje* was suppressed from view in nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarly, literary, and artistic records. For example, detribalized Native peoples did not appear in the photographic archives of men such as Edward Curtis, who preferred to capture “authentic” tribal identity and culture.⁴² Furthermore, some

Genízaro descendants were wary of making explicit claims to indigenous Genízaro ancestry. In 1909, President William Howard Taft officially recognized the Abiquiú land grant that was made to Genízaro families under colonial Spain. Yet, in 1928 Abiquiú's Genízaro descendants voted against Abiquiú being granted official status as a Native American pueblo, having witnessed the marginalization of New Mexico's Pueblos and the interference of federal powers.⁴³ Not until 2007 did New Mexico's state legislature officially recognize Genízaros as an indigenous people and acknowledge the contributions of their descendants.⁴⁴ While researching Genízaro culture for a documentary film project recently, cultural activist and filmmaker Cynthia Jeannette Gómez claimed that the Genízaro experience is still "one which modern descendants both embrace or staunchly deny." She describes Genízaros as "a people without a tribe."⁴⁵ Similarly, when referring to the absence of memory, tribal identity, and sovereignty among present-day Genízaro descendants, Coyote/Genízaro/Pueblo scholar Bernardo Gallegos declared, "We are on our own!"⁴⁶

A similar desire to counteract official forms of denial and erasure has shaped Montoya's artistic and curatorial decisions. Montoya described the process behind her 2000 *Nuevo Me-Xicanos* exhibit of Chicano art as one of "historical reclamation." She explained: "Our lived reality had never been expressed artistically. We were drawing on a collective memory, a memory of absence. We're trying to discuss things that have never been discussed."⁴⁷ Official forms of ethnographic erasure and denial, together with the long-standing social marginalization of Genízaros, affected intergenerational memory in New Mexico, and in Montoya's own family. Today, a number of Genízaro descendants live in the eastern New Mexican community of Las Vegas, home to Montoya's matrilineal family. Yet when growing up with Mexican friends from Omaha's packing house district, Montoya recalls her mother insisting that the family was of pure Spanish origin and certainly not Mexican, a claim that Montoya explains, "refers to our emergence from the Spanish colonial

system.” Montoya mused: “In Mexico I am a tourist, I have no relatives to visit. The same thing is true when I am in Spain. Am I really Spanish?” Reflecting on her mother’s claims, Montoya recalls that New Mexican Hispano culture embodies certain unknowns that do not fit neatly into either Spanish or Mexican cultural frameworks, namely “things that [Hispanos] do that aren’t Mexican, words that aren’t exactly Mexican words, and certain customs.” Commenting on this phenomenon, she adds: “even the family doesn’t quite understand what it is, because it’s been silenced in many ways; it was forgotten, but the patterns are still there.”⁴⁸ To understand these contradictions and ambiguous cultural patterns, Montoya looks not necessarily to Mexico, as in much Chicana feminist practice, but to local Genízaro culture.

Montoya’s recuperation of La Genízara in the form of a present-day *mestiza* body mirrors a wider pattern in which “modern *mestizos*,” to quote Curtis Marez, “raid the Comanchería past for strategies of survival and opposition in the present.”⁴⁹ Today, some Hispano communities perform their Native affiliations through dance, drama, and music. The dance-drama Los Comanches is performed in the communities of Abiquiú and Ranchos de Taos on specific Catholic feast days. Residents dress in Native costume to act out the 1779 defeat of the Comanche chief Cuerno Verde (Green Horn) and the eventual Comanche truce with colonial Spain in 1785. These performances draw on Native-origin instruments such as the hand drum or *tombé*, and in Abiquiú specifically, the Nanillé dance involves local children dressing as Native captives. In its contemporary guise, Los Comanches celebrates not just the eventual truce after years of war, but Hispano affiliations with Comanche and Genízaro communities through the performance of rituals mimicking the ransom and adoption of Native captives. These rituals form the basis for practices of healing and reconciliation within the community.⁵⁰

Comanche performances have taken place in communities off the beaten track and out of the sight of Santa Fe-based tourists and anthropologists. The dance-drama received some exposure in the 1960s and 1970s during the period of Chicano civil rights activism, which focused on returning land lost to the United States after 1848 and the recuperation of indigenous ancestry, most notably through Reies López Tijerina's Federal Alliance of Land Grants. Chicano activism helped to reignite an affiliation with the Comanchería past, notes Enrique Lamadrid: members of a key Chicano activist youth organization in New Mexico named themselves Los Comancheros del Norte, while the Comanche performance group Los Comanches de la Serna expressed solidarity with the Chicano Movement.⁵¹ The Comanches, who extended their influence in spite of Spanish colonial rule, and Genízaro emissaries, who became frontier warriors in their own right, have thus provided a model of cultural affirmation and ethnic pride for socially marginalized present-day communities.

Yet Genízaro culture has only received extended scholarly and artistic attention in the last decade. In 2000, folklore scholar Enrique Lamadrid and photographer Miguel Gandert collaborated on a photographic essay dedicated to exploring the Indo-Hispano heritage called *Nuevo México Profundo*, a title that played on the influential 1987 study of indigeneity in contemporary Mexico by anthropologist Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, *México Profundo*. Gandert's images evolved out of the University of New Mexico's exhibition, *400 Years of Indo-Hispano Culture*, which was part of the 1998 quarto-centennial of Oñate's arrival in New Mexico, and then in 2000, as the inaugural show for Albuquerque's National Hispanic Cultural Center (NHCC), an organization known for questioning purist narratives of Hispano art and culture and Santa Fe's artistic hegemony.⁵² In 2011, the NHCC supported *The Genízaro Experience: A Living Legacy*, a project and social media campaign organized by the Genízaro Federation of New Mexico in tandem with the Albuquerque Cultural Center and New Mexico Humanities Council.

The Genízaro experience has also been recorded in folklore and captivity narratives. Enrique Lamadrid and Brenda Romero have recuperated New Mexico's musical ballad tradition dating from the late eighteenth century, the *indita* (literally "little Indian girl"), in relation to the history of Native-Spanish interaction. Not only was the *indita* influenced by Native musical forms and choruses; some *inditas*, particularly those narrating tales of captivity, were written not just about but also by Christianized Genízaros. As the ballad form moved from central Mexico to New Mexico, the standard representation of the Native woman as an "eroticized" figure changed. The Native female subject became the focus for what Romero calls an emerging "lament style," a stylistic shift in which the *indita* came to represent "a personification and feminization of the land, with associated implications of an indigenous conceptualization of the land and culture." If the *indita* tradition is rooted in a broader pattern of Chicano *mestizaje* that is tied to loss and melancholy, ultimately, for Romero, the genre constitutes "a way of coming to terms with our indigenous mother."⁵³ Likewise, in research based on the Sánchez/Sarracino family of Atrisco in Albuquerque's South Valley, Bernardo Gallegos found that songs about "Comanchitas" (a term used for Native "servants/matriarchs") are sung to remember the family's and community's indigenous ancestral roots, and to recognize the ways in which Native women passed these songs down from generation to generation.⁵⁴

La Genízara and Chicana feminism

Montoya's work functions in a similar way to the *indita*, by exploring *mestizaje* through the recovery of a "lost" indigenous female subject. Native American and Chicana feminist scholars agree that the "loss of memory" and the failure to know one's matrilineal heritage are intimately tied to colonial subjection.⁵⁵ In this sense, Montoya's work provides an alternative *mestiza* genealogy rooted in a feminist critique of slavery and colonialism in the

Americas. If Genízaros were “dishonoured” figures marginalized by Spanish and Pueblo communities alike, according to Ramón Gutiérrez, enslaved Native women were also physically abused and raped by their masters; many Native women bore illegitimate offspring, as in the case of Cynthia Jeannette Gómez’s great-grandmother, Rosa María Chávez, a child servant who went on to give birth to three children by her master.⁵⁶ These illegitimate *mestizo* children, who were known as *coyotes*, often endured servitude and took the status of their mothers, particularly if masters denied Native women the right to marry.⁵⁷ In her study of the Texas borderlands, historian Juliana Barr argues that colonial power and *mestizaje* were shaped as much by patterns of “sexual exchange and mediation” as by categories of race and culture.⁵⁸ Certainly, in colonial New Mexico, a preference for young female slaves—hence the young girl in Montoya’s image—soon emerged. Census records between 1750 and 1790 show that two thirds of all captives were women and children, while female captives cost twice as much as male captives at trade fairs.⁵⁹

In Montoya’s *Sacred Heart* series, La Genízara is accompanied by the equally child-like figure of La Malinche. Asta Kuusinen has identified elements of “confinement” in Montoya’s depiction of La Malinche, the Nahua mistress of Hernán Cortés. Presented as a “little virgin bride” clothed in a white *quinceañera* dress, Montoya’s La Malinche becomes an “object of desire,” who is stripped of her indigenous heritage in preparation for acculturation and submission to the “male gaze.”⁶⁰ Kuusinen’s interpretation of Montoya’s child-subjects in *Sacred Heart* chimes with James Brooks’ understanding of the role that girl characters play in New Mexico’s Los Comanches and Los Matachines performances, the latter referring to a religious dance-drama that narrates the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire. In Los Comanches, the female character is often the Comanche chieftain’s daughter; in Los Matachines, she is La Malinche dressed as a girl in white to symbolize purity, innocence, and virginity. Yet both performances, argues Brooks, express powerful forms of

male sexual desire and dominance, with the ethnic and kin identity of each girl-child figure being “deliberately shrouded.”⁶¹ Montoya’s *La Genízara* functions as a feminist counter-response to the rituals of masculine power and honor that are embedded in New Mexico’s dance-dramas, revealing what has long been “deliberately shrouded”—not necessarily La Genízara’s “lost” ethnic or tribal origin, but rather her bodily exploitation through practices of slavery, patriarchy, and sexual violence. Montoya’s *La Genízara* is also a counter-response to some of the extant Hispano captivity narratives, which, according to literary scholar Tey Diana Rebolledo, cocoon the brutal realities of Native female enslavement within romanticized portrayals of Spanish-Mexican society as based on paternalistic masters, family cohesion, and cross-ethnic friendships.⁶² The lone figure of La Genízara is also a rejoinder to the *casta* painting, which traditionally framed *mestizaje* within a harmonious picture of domestic family life, love, and social order, rather than as the product of ethnic conflict, rape, and violence.⁶³

La Genízara exemplifies Cherrie Moraga’s model of “dismembered womanhood”; she also stands alongside other maligned and outcast figures in Chicana feminist thought and narrative, such as La Malinche, La Llorona/La Loca, and Coyolxhauqui. Chicana feminist writing often emphasizes the body as a site of oppression and memory through what Norma Alarcón calls the “recodification of the Native woman.” “As tribal ‘ethnicities’ are broken down by conquest and colonizations,” notes Alarcón, “bodies are often multiply racialized and dislocated as if they had no other contents. The effort to recontextualize the process recovers, speaks for, or gives voice to, women on the bottom of a historically hierarchical economic and political structure.” If Montoya replicates the Chicana “effort to pluralize the racialized body... through the reappropriation of the native woman on Chicana feminist terms,” she also complicates an established Chicana framework that privileges Mexico’s pre-Columbian Aztec past.⁶⁴ Instead, Montoya excavates the history of New Mexico’s nomadic

Indian-Spanish interaction to formulate a *mestiza* consciousness based on the regional specificities of colonial history.

La Genízara in New Mexico, past and present

Montoya's series emerged at the same time as Chicana feminist Ana Castillo's New Mexican-based novel, *So Far From God* (1993). Castillo's novel narrates the story of a family of outcasts, single mother Sofi and her four daughters, who employ local indigenous healing practices and forms of hybrid spirituality to palliate social inequality and patriarchal oppression in what Castillo calls the "Land of Entrapment."⁶⁵ Montoya's other female subjects in *El Sagrado Corazón*, La Curandera (healer) and La Loca, mirror Castillo's characters Doña Felicia and Sofi's daughters, Caridad and La Loca Santa, who are imbued with spiritual healing powers. Perhaps the figure of La Genízara also speaks to Castillo's setting of *So Far From God* in the community of Tomé, a place south of Albuquerque where, together with neighboring Belén, sixty Genízaro families had settled by 1778, and where some residents today claim Apache origins.⁶⁶ Indeed, at one point in Castillo's narrative, Tomé locals claim that the resurrected Caridad is the "ghost of Lozen, Warm Springs Apache mystic woman," a warrior whom Caridad mirrors as she thwarts attempts by the community's menfolk to eject her from the cave in which she lives. Significantly, Caridad later dies at the hands of Francisco el Penitente, who develops an obsession with Sofi's daughter.⁶⁷ Much like Castillo's text, Montoya's image exposes the patriarchal exclusivity of Catholic brotherhoods such as the Penitentes, and of other male-centered kinship groups that developed in New Mexico.

Montoya's iconographic and textual interventions on the wall behind and on the ground beneath La Genízara reference distinct patterns of kinship and activism in New Mexico's Chicano, Hispano, and Native American communities. The mark-making on the

wall, the graffiti which states “*como mis carnales*”—Spanish for “as, or like my brothers”—is multivalent. Firstly, it suggests the Penitente Brotherhood, the Hispano confraternity to which Montoya’s grandfather belonged, a group that became known for resisting the incursions associated with Anglo-American rule after 1848. Although La Genízara is encircled by Catholic *luminarias*, candles traditionally used to light the way for the Christ Child, she represents not necessarily the process of Native Christianization, but rather the perpetuation of Native beliefs and sign systems beneath the façade of Christianity. The placing of Genízaro culture within a Catholic setting gestures towards scholarship that suggests Genízaros influenced the rituals of the Penitente Brotherhood through their affiliations with male-only rites of flagellation, bloodletting, and purification in Pueblo and Plains Indian cultures. Numerous *moradas* were built in Genízaro communities during the early 1800s, the time of the Brotherhood’s expansion; communities with large Genízaro populations went on to become areas where the Brotherhood flourished, while some Penitente leaders today claim indigenous ancestry. Ramón Gutiérrez argues that confraternities offered Genízaros one of the few available options to articulate their sense of communal and ethnic identity in opposition to the forces of acculturation and social marginalization. He also suggests that Penitente practices were “initially rituals of slave manumission.”⁶⁸

James Brooks argues that kinship structures in Native and Spanish-Mexican societies, ranging from adoption and *compadrazgo* to concubinage, allowed Genízaros to become “cousins,” and, most importantly, “agents of conflict, conciliation, and cultural redefinition.”⁶⁹ From the 1960s, Chicano activists integrated forms of *mestizaje* and brotherhood into their own brand of radical cultural politics. In this respect, Montoya’s graffiti alludes to Chicano civil rights activist, Reies López Tijerina, who demanded the return of New Mexico’s land grants and recognition of Hispanos’ indigenous ancestry by

proclaiming, “We are the people the Indians call their ‘lost brothers.’”⁷⁰ Chicana artist-scholar Amalia Mesa-Bains has explored the concept of *carnal*, which references the body, blood, and sacrifice in indigenous and Spanish Catholic cultures, and the word’s connection to the creation of a fictive kin network through forms of *carnalismo* (brotherhood) in Chicano community and artistic production. Mesa-Bains describes *carnalismo* as a form of “creative bodily resistance,” a mode of “aesthetic heroicness of self-representation in an alienating world,” which becomes manifest in “[t]ransgressive, defiant, impertinent stylizations of dress, stance gaze, and gesture,” often in the use of hand gestures that mark territory and neighborhood.⁷¹ Montoya’s images from *Sacred Heart*, notably *Los Jovenes*, express a similar connection between kinship, “bodily resistance,” and “aesthetic heroicness,” by articulating contemporary forms of *barrio* solidarity. So too does *La Genízara*, in its direct textual reference to *carrales*, and through the imprinting of hand gestures that encircle Montoya’s female subject. Reflecting on *barrio* life, Montoya once said “that our true warriors are the urban warriors, [those who haven’t] given in to the colonial powers.”⁷² In this sense, Montoya’s mark-making in *La Genízara* maps *barrio carnalismo* onto an earlier warrior spirit, and onto male rituals of honor, kinship, and military prowess among Plains Indians, which also incorporated hand gestures and sign language.⁷³ Montoya’s mural and graffiti art forms resemble petroglyphs (rock art) and pictographs found in New Mexico and across Comanchería territory. Petroglyphs were not just prehistoric; they were created by Comanches during the eighteenth century as a result of frontier conflict, and often mimicked hand gestures used in Comanche warrior society.⁷⁴

The presence of Montoya’s female subject, however, works to question masculinist forms of representation, ritual, and kinship found in Comanche warrior society, Hispano religious practice, Chicano activism, and Anglo visual culture. Ann Marie Leimer has identified references to *carnalismo* (a feminized version of brotherhood) in Montoya’s earlier

work, *Codex Delilah* (1992). Montoya's *Sagrado Corazón* also recodifies masculinist rhetoric and imagery, evident in the Chicana pairing of *La Loca y Sweetie* and in *La Genízara*.⁷⁵ In *La Genízara* we find a female subject inhabiting what appears to be the traditionally male-only domain of the Brotherhood's *morada*, and she is, notes Montoya, "standing on sacred ground." Before producing the photographic series *Saints and Sinners* (1992), Montoya entered into and photographed the *morada* that her grandfather once attended.⁷⁶ Placing a female body, her own and that of La Genízara, into a patriarchal space, Montoya speaks back to the male confraternity whilst questioning the dominant Anglo male archive that recorded the Brotherhood's secret rituals on camera. Perhaps playing with the absence/presence trope at work in Ansel Adams' 1929-1930 photograph of an empty Penitente *morada*, Montoya presents La Genízara as the female embodiment of the wooden saint that appears in Adams' image; surrounded by *luminarias*, La Genízara becomes an indigenous, feminized version of the Christ Child. Lastly, as a play on Montoya's own illicit entry into her grandfather's *morada*, we might suggest that the mark-maker is La Genízara or Montoya herself, seeking incorporation, "like her brothers," into an Indo-Hispano heritage based on matrilineality. Montoya's multivalent image, her use of mimesis, and visual layering tap into a memory of absence through which La Genízara, and the many forms of colonialism that have long silenced her, become visible.

La Genízara and Montoya's *malcriadas*

Montoya's excavation of the "Indian mother" in *La Genízara* becomes not just about the "lost" origin of a *mestizo* people or a romanticized lament (as in the *indita*), but an important foundation for critique and activism. The textual and symbolic references to kinship, warrior culture, and the liberation and rebirth of enslaved subjects through religious ritual, all point towards the possibility of future collective action, and Montoya's mixed iconographies and

genres—Native petroglyphs and Catholic symbolism; nineteenth-century collotype printing, muralism, graffiti, and photography—blur notions of time to bring La Genízara into the present as a Chicana-*mestiza* subject. In Montoya’s genealogy, La Genízara stands not just as a symbol of “motherhood reclaimed,” but also as an emblem of “sisterhood honored” in a contemporary setting.

Although Genízara women differed from their male warrior counterparts, they had powers of a certain kind. Recent scholarship by James Brooks suggests that Genízaras were embedded in a “deeply ambivalent dialectic between exploitation and negotiation,” and exerted more agency than scholars previously assumed through patterns of kinship, labor, and diplomacy.⁷⁷ Similarly, Juliana Barr has argued that Native female captives regulated male power by operating as peace brokers in a system based on kinship and a “diplomacy of gender.”⁷⁸ When placed in the context of Montoya’s broader portfolio, La Genízara also becomes an agent rather than simply an object or commodity, echoing Cynthia Jeannette Gómez’s claim that Genízaros and their descendants “have always been more than captives and slaves.”⁷⁹ In particular, La Genízara becomes the foundation for an alternative lineage of female warriors or *malcriadas* that Montoya has developed in subsequent photographic, film, and installation work. These *malcriadas* include Doña Sebastiana, New Mexico’s skeletal folk heroine or angel of death, who features in Penitente rituals and in Montoya’s *Sagrado Corazón* series as La Muerte. In the artist’s 2002 film installation, Doña Sebastiana becomes not just a skeleton, but an embodied woman who desires sainthood, and, “if not love, at least to be respected,” explains Montoya.⁸⁰ Montoya’s lineage of *malcriadas* also includes a revised version of La Llorona (2004), the “monstrous” woman destined to walk the earth after killing her children for the man she loves and a figure who connects with Montoya’s earlier image of *La Loca*, as well as the professional female boxers of Montoya’s series *Women Boxers: The New Warriors* (2006) (Figure 6). In 2009, Montoya co-curated *Chicana*

Badgirls: Los Hociconas (loudmouths), an “exhibition of solidarity” that united New Mexican, Texan, and California-based Chicana artists against what co-curator Laura Pérez called “the racist, classist sexism rooted in the historic misogyny that accompanied the European invasion and settling of the Americas.” *Chicana Badgirls* featured Alma López’s reworking of the original *Our Lady*. In López’s *Our Lady of Controversy II* (2008), Guadalupe reappears, this time wearing boxing gloves, and no doubt in dialogue with Montoya’s own “new warriors.”⁸¹ Montoya’s decision to rehabilitate maligned figures such as La Llorona/La Loca and contemporary female boxers offers an intriguing connection back to the gendered dimensions of *casta* painting, a genre that continues to shape the artist’s work. Art historian Evelina Guzauskyte has found that *casta* paintings depicting violent scenes between wives and husbands present women’s “disruptive” behavior rather than men’s as causing the breakdown of family harmony and social order.⁸² Montoya’s *malcriadas*, then, form part of a broader attempt to reconfigure established patriarchal models of family and kinship that locate women as simultaneously chaste and unchaste, virtuous, and destructive.

Montoya’s current project redeploys the *casta* painting genre to explore colonialism’s relationship to contemporary forms of kinship and inequality. In *Nuestra “Calidad”*: *Contemporary Casta Portraits* (2014-), Montoya replays the eighteenth-century colonial aesthetic using portraits of contemporary families from Santa Fe and Houston. Just as the *casta* subject in colonial portraiture was in reality an “imagined and unstable” entity, the complexity of contemporary family structure in Montoya’s portraits breaks the confines of the original *casta* painting. Yet Montoya also reminds us that colonial notions of blood purity still determine social status in contemporary New Mexico, in the same way that *casta* paintings persisted into the early nineteenth century when the racial classifications on which they were based had become legally obsolete.⁸³ Just as some contemporary Hispano families

have lost or denied their Genízaro ancestry, the persistence of the *casta* system has also been ignored. And yet, explains Montoya, “that footprint is still there, it’s still intact ... We negotiate around it, we understand the rules, but we don’t talk about it.” Indeed, Montoya argues that the historical process of moving up the *casta* hierarchy based on the notion of “cleansing the blood,” explains “why you get populations that forget.”⁸⁴ In linking the *casta* system with the historical act of forgetting, Montoya’s work comes full circle, providing the foundation for invoking a “memory of absence” in the present.

Montoya’s portraits from *Sagrado Corazón*, specifically “La Familia,” prefigure her contemporary *casta* paintings, with *La Genízara* subverting an earlier *casta* tradition by stripping its subject of the traditional family unit. Ultimately, Montoya’s experimentation with *casta* painting draws us back to the racialized, gendered, and social dimensions of the term “caste” under Spanish and U.S American systems of colonial rule, “caste” deriving from the Latin word for “chaste.” At the same time, an image such as *La Genízara* alludes to the possibilities embodied in the term *carnal* and the potential significance of kin and gender networks to alleviate colonial oppression. In *La Genízara*, the graffitied references to kin promise to relocate the outcast and so-called unchaste female body within some form of future collectivity. Perhaps this collectivity is the increasingly complex *mestizo* family that Montoya seeks to document in her contemporary *casta* painting. Or, perhaps it is the extended family belonging to the woman boxer, María Lucy Contreras. She stands defiantly among her kin as a symbol of strength and endurance, a *malcriada* and warrior for our times (Figure 6), whose profile in the exhibition catalog for *Women Boxers* (2006), declares that women’s boxing “has provided her with a community.”⁸⁵ Indeed, it is no surprise to find this image of a female boxer surrounded by her family being used as a preface to the contemporary *casta* painting on the artist’s project web site, for this photograph epitomizes the coming together of an extended, matrilineal-focused kin network. In many ways, this

image represents the culmination of Montoya's earlier work, and her celebration of a *mestiza* genealogy in which a contemporary female-centered collectivity becomes the embodiment of a long history of struggle rooted in the colonial figure of La Genízara.

In 2007, Montoya exhibited in *Lifting the Veil: New Mexico Women and the Tri-Cultural Myth* at Santa Fe's Institute of American Indian Arts Museum. This diverse show of New Mexican women's art sought to challenge the myth-making at the heart of tri-culturalism by revealing neglected patterns of *mestizaje* and transculturation. As participating Native American artist Tatiana Lomahaftewa Singer added, the process of forgetting, or of denying what Noriega calls "histories-in-relation," has negative consequences for individuals and families. Women's art has become instrumental in the process of memory and recuperation, for as curator Paula Rivera explains, "women ... are often the ones who bring the varied traditions within one family together."⁸⁶ Montoya's work as a whole achieves a similar goal, by putting the pieces back together to forge an alternative collectivity, a family or kin network that is not bound by patriarchal forms of exclusion or essentialist notions of race and blood purity.

Conclusion

In *El Sagrado Corazón* (1993), Montoya explores the "histories-in-relation" that stem from structures of colonial power and oppression in New Mexico, and which appear most powerfully in *La Genízara*. In this portrait, Montoya develops a new visual language forged from the "subordination" and subversion of colonialist and patriarchal cultures of display, ritual, and kinship. This new visual language enables Montoya to tell the complex history of a female figure that is too often lost or silenced in the archive. Constance Cortez writes that "[t]o be Chicana/o is to be informed by many colonial pasts that simultaneously suggest multiple readings of the present."⁸⁷ In acknowledging the varied forms and complex

historical interactions between Spanish, Native, and U.S. American systems of colonial rule, and the capacity of visual representation to both objectify and empower the subject, Montoya reads colonialism differently and in multiple ways. She once described her work as being motivated by a “call to reach across a chasm of history, a history that has been neglected or not been discussed ... to re-invoke that ... [and] to get people to think about it differently.”⁸⁸ By recuperating an indigenous female subject, Montoya challenges the racial, elitist, and patriarchal thinking at the core of the Spanish colonial myth, exposing a *mestiza* genealogy that becomes the foundation for alternative forms of ethnic affiliation and gender solidarity. “I think we have to live up to the term *malcriadas*,” claimed Montoya in 2001.⁸⁹ Critics have perhaps viewed Montoya as a *malcriada* by positioning her in relation to artistic traditions that derive from outside of New Mexico. Yet Montoya’s work must also be viewed as that of an insider who is actively “coloring out the lines,” and as a serious contribution to the belated process of demythologizing and decolonizing New Mexico.

I would like to thank the artist Delilah Montoya who very generously offered her time to talk with me about her work and who very kindly granted permission for the reproduction of the images in this article.

¹ Delilah Montoya, artist statement, “Nuestra ‘Calidad’: Contemporary Casta Portraits,”

<http://www.delilahmontoya.com/ContempCasta/casta.html> (accessed December 2, 2013).

² Delilah Montoya quoted in Leanne Potts, “Me-Xicanos,” *Albuquerque Tribune*, September 29, 2000, C1.

³ I use the term “Hispano” to reflect the emergence of a distinctive form of ethnic identity politics in New Mexico from the late nineteenth century, one tied to discourses of whiteness and a Spanish colonial identity. For more on “Hispano” as a distinctive marker of ethnic identity in New Mexico, see Charles Montgomery, *The Spanish Redemption: Heritage, Power, and Loss on New Mexico’s*

Upper Rio Grande (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 14; and John M. Nieto-Phillips, *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish-American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s–1930s* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 81–82.

⁴ Russell M. Magnaghi, “The Genízaro Experience in Spanish New Mexico,” in *Spain and the Plains: Myths and Realities of Spanish Exploration and Settlement on the Great Plains*, eds. Ralph H. Vigil, Frances W. Kaye, and John R. Wunder (1994; repr. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2007), 114–115; James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 123.

⁵ Adrian Bustamante, “The Matter Was Never Resolved”: The Casta System in Colonial New Mexico, 1693–1823,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 66, no.2 (April 1991): 148, 159, 162–163.

⁶ For example, see Nieto-Phillips, *The Language of Blood*, especially 51–92; Montgomery, *The Spanish Redemption*, especially 55–88.

⁷ Charles Montgomery, “The Trap of Race and Memory: The Language of Spanish Civility on the Upper Rio Grande,” *American Quarterly* 52, no.3 (September 2000): 478–513. Also see John Bodine, *A Tri-Ethnic Trap: The Spanish Americans in Taos* (University of Washington Press, 1968), and Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997).

⁸ Luis Jiménez quoted in Camille Flores-Turney, *Howl: The Artwork of Luis Jiménez*, with an introduction by Dave Hickey (Santa Fe: New Mexico Magazine, 1997), 27.

⁹ Michael L. Trujillo, “Oñate’s Foot: Remembering and Dismembering in Northern New Mexico,” *Aztlán* 33, no. 2 (Fall 2008): 91–119. Also see Phillip B. Gonzales, “History Hits the Heart: Albuquerque’s Great Cuatrocenenario Controversy, 1997–2005,” and Kathy Freise, “Contesting Oñate: Sculpting the Shape of Memory,” both in *Expressing New Mexico: Nuevomexicano Creativity, Ritual, and Memory*, ed. Phillip B. Gonzales (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 207–232; 233–252.

¹⁰ Alma López, "The Artist of *Our Lady* (April 2, 2001)," in *Our Lady of Controversy: Alma López's Irreverent Apparition*, eds. Alicia Gaspar de Alba and Alma López (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 14.

¹¹ Cherríe Moraga quoted in Catrióna Rueda Esquibel, "Do U Think I'm a Nasty Girl?" in *Our Lady of Controversy*, 208.

¹² López, "The Artist of *Our Lady*," 14.

¹³ Brother S. A, F.S.C., 3/25/01, quoted in "Appendix: *Cyber Arte Meets Technology*: Selected Viewer Comments," in *Our Lady of Controversy*, 294. Also see Tey Marianna Nunn, "The Our Lady Controversy: Chicana Art, Hispanic Identity, and the Politics of Place and Gender in Nuevo México," in *Expressing New Mexico: Nuevomexicano Creativity, Ritual, and Memory*, ed. Phillip B. Gonzales (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 174-180.

¹⁴ Alicia Gaspar de Alba, "Devil in a Rose Bikini: The Second Coming of Our Lady in Santa Fe," and Deena J. González, "Making Privates Public: It's not about La Virgen of the Conquest, but about the Conquest of La Virgen," both in *Our Lady of Controversy*, 242, 73.

¹⁵ For example, see Nunn, "The Our Lady Controversy," 177-178; Patricio Chávez quoted in Alma López, "Silencing Our Lady: La Respuesta de Alma," *Aztlán* 26, no.2 (Fall 2001): 260.

¹⁶ Alicia Gaspar de Alba, *Chicano Art Inside/Outside the Master's House: Cultural Politics and the CARA Exhibition* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 126.

¹⁷ Montoya quoted in Potts, "Nuevo Me-Xicanos."

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ruth López [no headline], *Santa Fe New Mexican*, February 19, 1999, <http://www.newslibrary.com/sites/sf/> (accessed January 26, 2013); Montoya quoted in Potts, "Nuevo Me-Xicanos."

²⁰ Delilah Montoya, "Artist Statement," <http://www.cla.purdue.edu/waaw/ressler/artists/montoyastat.html> (accessed March 15, 2013); Montoya, "Nuestra 'Calidad': Contemporary Casta Portraits."

²¹ Jennifer González, *Subject to Display: Reframing Race in Contemporary Installation Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), 5-6.

²² Montoya quoted in "Portfolio Biographies: Delilah Montoya," *Camerawork: A Journal of Photographic Arts* 23, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 1996): 27.

²³ Montoya, "Nuestra 'Calidad': Contemporary Casta Portraits."

²⁴ Chon A. Noriega, "Many Wests," in eds. Chon A. Noriega and Jennifer A. González, *From the West: Chicano Narrative Photography* (San Francisco: The Mexican Museum, 1995), 12. Montoya's *Shooting the Tourist* series appears in the exhibition catalog on pages 62-70, and is also discussed in Jennifer A. González's essay on the exhibition, "Negotiated Frontiers," 19.

²⁵ A number of recent studies have focused on Montoya's photographic work, particularly in the context of Chicana feminist practice, Montoya's use of religious iconography, her subversion of artistic genres from portraiture to landscape art, and her attention to the complex interaction between history, memory, and forgetting. For example, see Charlene Villaseñor Black, "Sacred Cults, Subversive Icons: Chicanas and the Pictorial Language of Catholicism," in eds. D. Leticia Galindo and María Dolores Gonzales, *Speaking Chicana: Voice, Power and Identity* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999), 149-160; Constance Cortez, "History/Whose-Story? Postcoloniality and Contemporary Chicana Art," *Chicana/Latina Studies* 6, no.2 (Spring 2007): 22-54; Asta M. Kuusinen, "Shooting from the Wild Zone: A Study of the Chicana Art Photographers Laura Aguilar, Celia Álvarez Muñoz, Delilah Montoya, and Kathy Vargas" (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2006); Asta M. Kuusinen, "Ojo de la Diosa: Becoming Divine in Delilah Montoya's Art Photography," *Aztlán* 33, no.1 (Spring 2008): 32-61; Ann Marie Leimer, "Re-Membering the Body: Spiritual Genealogy, Collective Memory, and Lost Histories in Delilah Montoya's Codex Delilah," April 1, 2004, National Association for Chicano and Chicana Studies Annual Conference, Paper 3, 10-33, <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs/2002-2004/Proceedings/3/> (accessed February 18, 2014); Laura Pérez, *Chicana Art: The Politics of Spiritual and Aesthetic Altarities* (Durham: Duke University Press 2007); *Contemporary Chicana and Chicano Art: Artists, Works, Culture, and Education*, eds. Gary Keller et al (Tempe, AZ.: Bilingual Press, 2002), 148-150. For Montoya's work, see the artist's online

portfolio, <http://www.delilahmontoya.com/Home.html>; her solo exhibition, *Women Boxers: The New Warriors* (Houston: Arte Público Press, 2006); and her essay, "On Photographic Digital Imaging," *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 27: 1 (Spring 2002): 181-189. Montoya's work has also featured in the following exhibitions of Chicano/a art: *CARA, Chicano Art: Resistance and Affirmation*, eds. Richard Griswold del Castillo, Teresa McKenna, and Yvonne Yarbrow-Bejarano (Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Wight Art Gallery, 1991), 173-175; *Arte Latino: Treasures from the Smithsonian American Art Museum*, ed. Jonathan Yorba (New York: Watson-Guption Publications, 2001), 68-69; and *Phantom Sightings: Art After the Chicano Movement*, eds. Rita Gonzales, Howard N. Fox, and Chon A. Noriega (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008). Montoya's work was also on show at the recent Smithsonian exhibition, *Our America: The Latino Presence in American Art*, October 25, 2013 – March 2, 2014, and will feature in a one-woman exhibition entitled "Syncretism" at the New Mexico Museum of Art, Santa Fe, in August 2014.

²⁶ Kuusinen, "Shooting from the Wild Zone," 168. For Montoya's use of religious iconography in this series and other works, also see Kuusinen, "Ojo de la Diosa," 32-61.

²⁷ Rafael Pérez-Torres, *Mestizaje: Critical Uses of Race in Chicano Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 196-197.

²⁸ On this practice, see González, *Subject to Display*, 10.

²⁹ Magali M. Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain: Race, Lineage, and the Colonial Body in Portraiture and Casta Paintings* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 53; Ilona Katzew, *Casta Painting: Images of Race in Eighteenth-Century Mexico* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 63-67.

³⁰ Delilah Montoya, "El Sagrado Corazón," unpublished essay sent to the author, 15-16.

³¹ Delilah Montoya, interview with the author, April 6, 2014.

³² Villaseñor Black, "Sacred Cults," 155-156.

³³ Montoya, interview with the author.

³⁴ Cortez, "History/Whose-Story?", 51.

³⁵ Diana DePaolo Loren, "Corporeal Concerns: Eighteenth-Century Casta Paintings and Colonial Bodies in Spanish Texas," *Historical Archaeology* 41, no.1 (2007): 23-36.

³⁶ Ramón Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Flew Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), 149-150, 171, 305-306; Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 14, 38, 204, 355; "A Memorial Recognizing the Role of Genízaros in New Mexico History and Their Legacy," introduced by Ben Lujan, House Memorial 40, 48th Legislature, State of New Mexico, First Session, 2007, 1: <http://www.nmlegis.gov/Sessions/07%20Regular/memorials/house/HM040.html> (accessed December 1, 2013).

³⁷ For example, see Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 34.

³⁸ Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 305; Magnaghi, "The Genízaro Experience," 119, 122, 124.

³⁹ James Brooks, "This Evil Extends Especially to the Feminine Sex: Negotiating Captivity in the New Mexico Borderlands," *Feminist Studies* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 300.

⁴⁰ Curtis Marez, "Signifying Spain, Becoming Comanche, Making Mexicans: Indian Captivity and the History of Chicano/a Popular Culture," *American Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (June 2001): 279.

⁴¹ Magnaghi, "The Genízaro Experience," 124.

⁴² For a discussion of Curtis' photography in relation to contemporary Hispano photographers, see Noriega, "Many Wests," and González, "Negotiated Frontiers," in *From the West: Chicano Narrative Photography*, 12, 18-19.

⁴³ Seth Roffman, "The Genízaro Experience: A Living Legacy," *Green Fire Times: News and Views from a Sustainable Southwest*, June 2011, <http://greenfiretimes.com/2011/06/the-genizaro-experience-a-living-legacy/#.UxyARDeYbIU> (accessed December 2, 2013).

⁴⁴ "A Memorial Recognizing the Role of Genízaros in New Mexico History and Their Legacy."

⁴⁵ Cynthia Jeannette Gómez, "Without a Tribe: The Genízaro Experience," <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects/withoutatribe/without-a-tribe-the-genizaro-experience> (accessed January 25, 2014).

⁴⁶ Bernardo P. Gallegos, “‘Dancing the Comanches’: The Santo Niño, La Virgen (of Guadalupe), and the Genízaro Indians of New Mexico,” in *Indigenous Symbols and Practices in the Catholic Church*, ed. Kathleen J. Martin (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 212.

⁴⁷ Montoya quoted in Potts, “Nuevo Me-Xicano.”

⁴⁸ Delilah Montoya quoted in Carol Tucker, “Latino Artists Who Surprise,” November 18, 1996, <http://news.usc.edu/#!/article/12485/Latino-Artists-Who-Surprise/> (accessed November 6, 2013);

Montoya, interview with the author.

⁴⁹ Marez, “Signifying Spain, 287.

⁵⁰ Marez, “Signifying Spain,” 270; Enrique R. Lamadrid, *Hermanitos Comanchitos: Indo-Hispano Rituals of Captivity and Redemption* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 57.

⁵¹ Lamadrid, *Hermanitos Comanchitos*, 187-188, 193.

⁵² *Nuevo México Profundo: Rituals of an Indo-Hispano Homeland* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2000), photographs by Miguel Gandert with essays by Enrique R. Lamadrid, Ramón Gutiérrez, Lucy Lippard, and Chris Wilson; Lamadrid, *Hermanitos Comanchitos*, 202.

⁵³ Enrique Lamadrid, “History, Faith, and Intercultural Relations in Two New Mexican Inditas: ‘Plácida Romero’ and ‘San Luis Gonzaga’,” in *Nuevomexicano Cultural Legacy: Forms, Agencies, and Discourse*, ed. Francisco Lomelí, Víctor A. Sorell, and Genaro M. Padilla (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 164-184; Brenda M. Romero, “The Indita Genre of New Mexico: Gender and Cultural Identification,” in *Chicana Traditions: Continuity and Change*, eds. Norma E. Cantú and Olga Nájera-Ramírez (Urbana: University of Illinois, 2002), 68, 76, 58.

⁵⁴ Gallegos, “‘Dancing the Comanches’,” 205-206.

⁵⁵ For example, see Paula Gunn Allen, “Who is Your Mother? Red Roots of White Feminism,” in *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions* (1986; repr., Boston, Mass., Beacon Press, 1992), 209-210.

⁵⁶ Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 149-150, 183-184, 186-188; Gómez, “Without a Tribe: The Genízaro Experience.”

⁵⁷ Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 237.

-
- ⁵⁸ Juliana Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 288.
- ⁵⁹ Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 147; Magnaghi, "The Genízaro Experience," 117.
- ⁶⁰ Kuusinen, "Shooting from the Wild Zone," 173-174.
- ⁶¹ Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 4-8.
- ⁶² Tey Diana Rebolledo, "Las Hijas de la Malinche: Mexicana/India Captivity Narratives in the Southwest, Subverting Voices," in *Nuevomexicano Cultural Legacy: Forms, Agencies, and Discourse*, 140-141.
- ⁶³ For example, see Katzew, *Casta Painting*, 93.
- ⁶⁴ Norma Alarcón, "Chicana Feminism: In the Tracks of 'The' Native Woman," in *Living Chicana Theory*, ed. Carla Trujillo (Berkeley: Third Woman Press, 1998), 374-375.
- ⁶⁵ Ana Castillo, *So Far From God: A Novel* (1993; repr., New York: Penguin, 1994), 72.
- ⁶⁶ Gallegos, "'Dancing the Comanches'," 212-214.
- ⁶⁷ Castillo, *So Far From God*, 88.
- ⁶⁸ Ramón A. Gutiérrez, "Crucifixion, Slavery, and Death: The Hermanos Penitentes of the Southwest," in *Over the Edge: Remapping the American West*, eds. Valerie J. Matsumoto and Blake Allmendinger (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 257-258; Ramón A. Gutiérrez, review of Michael P. Carroll's "The Penitente Brotherhood: Patriarchy and Hispano Catholicism in New Mexico," (2002), *The Americas* 61, no.2 (October 2004): 315-316; Miguel Gandert, "Retratos de Mestizaje: A Photographic Survey of Indo-Hispanic Traditions of the Río Grande Corridor," in *Nuevomexicano Cultural Legacy: Forms, Agencies, and Discourse*, 77.
- ⁶⁹ Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*, 31-36.
- ⁷⁰ Reies López Tijerina quoted in David R. Maciel and Juan José Peña, "La Reconquista: The Chicano Movement in New Mexico," in *The Contested Homeland: A Chicano History of New Mexico*, eds. Erlinda Gonzales-Berry and David R. Maciel (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 274.

⁷¹ Amalia Mesa-Bains, "Chicano Bodily Aesthetics," in *Body/Culture: Chicano Figuration* (Rohnert Park, CA: University Art Gallery, Sonoma State University, 1990), 8-11.

⁷² Delilah Montoya quoted in Ruth López, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, 1999.

⁷³ Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*, 10-12, 221.

⁷⁴ For example, see Severin Fowles and Jimmy Arterberry, "Gesture and Performance in Comanche Rock Art," *World Art* 3, no.1 (2013): 67-82. For a discussion of the use of "coded signs" in Montoya's series in relation to Catholicism, see Villaseñor Black, "Sacred Cults," 154-160.

⁷⁵ Ann Marie Leimer, "Re-Membering the Body: Spiritual Genealogy, Collective Memory, and Lost Histories in Delilah Montoya's Codex Delilah," April 1, 2004, National Association for Chicano and Chicana Studies Annual Conference, Paper 3, 20-24, <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/naccs/2002-2004/Proceedings/3/> (accessed February 18, 2014).

⁷⁶ Kuusinen, "Shooting from the Wild Zone," 172-173; Montoya, interview with the author.

⁷⁷ James Brooks, "This Evil Extends Especially," 299.

⁷⁸ Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*, 2, 246-247.

⁷⁹ Gómez, "Without a Tribe."

⁸⁰ Delilah Montoya, "San Sebastiana Installations," http://www.delilahmontoya.com/installation/Sebastiana_Installs/index.html (accessed February 18, 2014).

⁸¹ Laura E. Pérez, "Con o Sin Permiso / With or Without Permission," in *Chicana Badgirls: Las Hociconas*, exhibition catalog, January 17 – March 21, 2009, 516 Arts, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 3. Also see Alma López, "It's Not about the Santa in My *Fe*, but the Santa Fe in My *Santa*," in *Our Lady of Controversy*, 288.

⁸² Evelina Guzauskyte, "Fragmented Borders: Fallen Men, Bestial Women: Violence in the *Casta* Paintings of Eighteenth-Century New Spain," *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 86, no. 2 (2009): 189.

⁸³ Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*, 135, 53.

⁸⁴ Montoya, interview with the author.

⁸⁵ Montoya, *Women Boxers* (2006), 32-33.

⁸⁶ Tatiana Lomahaftewa Singer and Paula Rivera, both quoted in Elizabeth Cook-Romero, “Myth Unmakers,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, March 2, 2007, <http://www.newslibrary.com/sites/sf/> (accessed January 26, 2013).

⁸⁷ Cortez, “History/Whose-Story?”, 51.

⁸⁸ Montoya, interview with the author.

⁸⁹ Delilah Montoya quoted in Robert Nott, “Perfect Ladies,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 1, 2001, <http://www.newslibrary.com/sites/sf/> (accessed January 26, 2013).